

REMARKS

Claims Status

Claims 1-23 were originally filed and are pending. In the Office Action, mailed June 30, 2005, claims 1-23 were rejected. In this Amendment and Response, independent claims 1 and 13 are amended, claims 2, 4, 5, 14, and 16 are cancelled, and claims 24-25 are added. Upon entry of the amendments in this paper, claims 1, 3, 6-13, 15, and 17-25 will be pending.

Related Cases

Applicant's attorney notes that there have been Office Actions issued in related cases U.S. Serial No. 09/750,188 and U.S. Serial No. 09/750,293. U.S. Serial No. 09/750,293 has been allowed. Applicant's attorney would be pleased to provide copies of the Office Actions if for any reason they are not available to the Examiner.

Objection to the Drawings

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to. The Office Action requested that the drawings be amended to show the features of claim 2. Applicant has cancelled claim 2, which should render this objection moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 due to the form of the claim. Applicant has cancelled claim 2, which should render this rejection moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

Claims 1-4, 10, 13-15, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,816,271 to Takahashi. Claims 5, 6, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Takahashi. Claims 7 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Takahashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,347 to Okada et al and U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0043753 to Grohs et al. Claims 8, 9, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Grohs. Claims 11, 12, 22, and 23 were rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Okada and U.S. Patent No. 6,738,158 to Lupien, Jr. et al.

Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the invention, and have included limitations from the dependent claims in the independent claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are patentable over the cited references.

As illustrated in figure 4 of Takahashi, Takahashi is directed generally to querying a selected printer about its printer language (S2), informing a printer driver about the printer language (S3), and taking steps (S7) if the printer language is not supported.

Amended independent Claim 1 now recites, in part, “raster image processor” and “print driver server.” This should distinguish the claimed networked graphics imaging system from the Takahashi microprocessor and operating system printer driver. See for example, pages 1-4 of Applicant’s specification and the discussion of the raster image processor (RIP) 105, and the print drive server (PDS) 110.

Claim 1 also, for example, further recites, in part, limitations from cancelled claims 4 and 5, clarifying which networks are used in certain steps, and specifying that a message is communicated “indicative of the second image data having been written to the second storage device.” The cited references do not show the claimed network usage or the claimed message. Applicant respectfully notes that this message is indicative of writing to data storage, which is different from the printer confirmation mentioned in paragraph 6 of the Office Action.

Amended independent claim 13 also recites, in part, a “raster image processor,” a “print driver server,” and “a message indicative of the first image data having been written to the first storage device” as well as added recitation of the “second communications network” in two places.

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicants claim a system and method that allows for high speed image communication over the first network, but still allows for communication over and workflow over the second network. The second network is used to communicate messages used for facilitating workflow over the first network. This is useful, for example, in integrating a first network (e.g., a storage network) into a graphics workflow environment where there is already a second network (e.g., an ethernet network). Applicant therefore submits that the claims are not obvious, and therefore patentable over the cited art. The dependent claims are

patentable because they depend on patentable base claims, and may also have additional features that distinguish them over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the application and claims in light of this Amendment and Response, and respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. If, in the Examiner's opinion, a telephonic interview would expedite the favorable prosecution of the present application, the Applicants' attorney would welcome the opportunity to discuss any outstanding issues, and to work with the Examiner toward placing the application in condition for allowance.

Please continue to direct all correspondence to:

AGFA Corporation
Law & Patent Department
200 Ballardvale Street
Wilmington, MA 01887

Customer No. 21013

Respectfully submitted,



Ira V. Heffan
Attorney for the Applicant
Goodwin Procter LLP
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, MA 02109

Date: September 30, 2005
Reg. No.: 41,059

Tel. No.: (617) 570-1777
Fax No.: (617) 523-1231

2608424